

RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

4701 WILLARD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND 20015 656-4068

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Face the Nation STATION WDVM-TV
CBS Network

DATE April 25, 1982 11:30 A.M. CITY Washington, D.C.

SUBJECT Interview with Senator Henry Jackson

ANNOUNCER: From CBS News Washington, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview on Face the Nation with Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat of Washington and a member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees.

Senator Jackson will be questioned by CBS News diplomatic correspondent Robert Pierpoint, by Lars Eric Nelson, Washington Bureau Chief for the New York Daily News, and by the moderator, CBS News correspondent George Herman.

[Reports on Falkland Islands Developments]

GEORGE HERMAN: Well, Senator Jackson, that is what we know as of this moment. So I guess my first question has to be this: Would you think, at this point, a major armed military clash is inevitable? Or is there still time for the diplomats to turn this thing around towards peace?

SENATOR HENRY JACKSON: I think we're virtually at the end of the road, Mr. Herman. It's clear that we have tried to play the role of honest broker. We will now have to decide whether we'll make this last-ditch effort today to go to London. And if that fails, then the next decision will be, which direction does the United States go in this conflict? Not military intervention, but I think there'll be a clear tilt to Britain.

*

*

*

HERMAN: Senator Jackson, in the last few moments in this fast-moving story there's been still another development, and that is this: that the junta in Argentina has made an announcement to its people, has put this story officially on the

OFFICES IN: WASHINGTON D.C. • NEW YORK • LOS ANGELES • CHICAGO • DETROIT • AND OTHER PRINCIPAL CITIES

Material supplied by Radio TV Reports, Inc. may be used for file and reference purposes only. It may not be reproduced, sold or publicly demonstrated or exhibited.

record. The junta announces -- this is the broadcast -- to the people of the Argentine nation that early today two British helicopters strafed the port in South Georgia Island, were repelled, so forth and so on. And then it says, "It is stressed that the attitude of British naval units is a flagrant violation of U.N. Security Council's Resolution 502 and places the United Kingdom in the situation of an aggressor country."

Is that your interpretation of the United Nation's rulings on the Argentine situation in the Falkland Islands?

SENATOR JACKSON: Certainly not. The Argentine government is in violation of the United Nations Charter, in using force to settle a dispute. That is at the heart of the whole U.N. process. And I don't buy that at all. That is simply, I think, an effort on the part of the military dictatorship to justify and to pave the way for further trouble for their people. They've got real trouble at home.

LARS NELSON: Senator Jackson, you suggested in your opening answer that this government now has to decide whether to tilt toward Britain or not. What do you mean by that? How far should we go in helping them?

SENATOR JACKSON: Well, I think it's clear that when the chips are down, our interests and the interests of Great Britain are obviously, by tradition and otherwise, much closer. We have to face the fact that the NATO countries are solidly behind Britain. Clearly, there's no obligation on our part, having gone that last mile to try to bring peace, to side with Argentina.

I do not mean intervention militarily. But I do suspect that we will have to join very well in the boycott of the movement of goods to Argentina.

After all, let's remember that Argentina was with the Nazis right up till 1943.

ROBERT PIERPOINT: But Senator, Argentina now seems to be more with the Soviet Union. They've switched sides. They've been selling wheat to the Soviet Union, against most of the world's boycott.

Do you think that this dispute over the Falklands has the possibility of escalating into a superpower confrontation?

SENATOR JACKSON: I don't think so. I don't think the Soviets -- while they love to fish in troubled waters, I don't see the Soviets reaching way down into the South Atlantic as the area of intervention on their part.

I think it does point up something that I feel very strongly about, and that is the need for a joint American-Soviet communications center. I mean manned around the clock. Not just a hot line, but a center. I'm working on this concept and it's in a conceptual stage right now. But it points up the need to avoid war by accident or miscalculation. That can always be a real danger. World War I was not premediated and designed; it was by accident and miscalculation.

HERMAN: Let me narrow the focus a little bit back down to simply Argentina versus Britain. You've already said that you don't think there should be any American manpower involved in it. But how about such things as American tankers, oil tankers at sea, perhaps, to refuel the British fleet, assistance of that kind?

SENATOR JACKSON: No, I think that we should, at this point in time, stay clear of any direct or indirect military support in that operation in the South Atlantic.

HERMAN: Do you support Senator Moynihan's Senate resolution that the United States should join the European Common Market's sanctions against Argentina?

SENATOR JACKSON: The sanctions, yes, I support.

HERMAN: Will it pass?

SENATOR JACKSON: Yes. I don't think there's any -- look, in this country the support for Britain runs all the way from the Wall Street Journal to the Village Voice.

HERMAN: Well, accepting that, let me ask you...

SENATOR JACKSON: And I think that's a pretty broad spectrum.

HERMAN: Accepting that as face value, as your statement...

SENATOR JACKSON: Yes, sir.

HERMAN: ...and there's a lot of agreement with that, how do you rate the Reagan Administration's performance in the balancing act, and have they balanced properly?

SENATOR JACKSON: Yes, I -- you know, we're always suspect. That is inevitable?

HERMAN: Who's we?

SENATOR JACKSON: We, the United States is suspect of

tilting or supporting the British side. But clearly, I think Secretary Haig has done a good job in being the honest broker. But here you have a regime in Argentina, a military dictatorship that's determined to get away from their troubles at home by going into the Falkland Islands. And this is at the heart of the problem.

PIERPOINT: But Senator, if the United States does tilt toward Argentina...

SENATOR JACKSON: Towards Britain.

PIERPOINT: I'm sorry, toward Britain. What happens to our policy vis-a-vis the rest of Latin America? And I'm thinking particularly of Argentina's help in our problems with the guerrillas in Central America. That's been one of the reasons we did not want to tilt toward Britain.

SENATOR JACKSON: I'm fully aware of those problems. I would also point out that it does not help us in South America and Central America to be aligned with a dictatorship run by the military. This is the third one in Argentina. And clearly, that does not help American foreign policy when the choice is between a country that is committed to freedom, who's been responsible around the world for giving up their colonies and leaving democratic institutions around the world. And I think the British clearly are in the right on this matter.

PIERPOINT: But you still have the problem...

SENATOR JACKSON: Oh, you have the problem.

PIERPOINT: ...of American policy in Latin America.

SENATOR JACKSON: Some would say it might be a Hobson's choice. We have NATO. I mean NATO is at the heart of this matter, and the NATO countries are 100 percent behind Great Britain.

So we're going to have to make some difficult decisions. But I think it's clear we must avoid direct military intervention.

NELSON: Senator, I'd like to return to the subject of the Soviet Union. As you know, May 1st is the target date within the Administration to have its new proposals on nuclear disarmament for the START talks. Have you been told how this government is going to proceed on START? And how do you think it should proceed? What should it measure? What should it restrict?

SENATOR JACKSON: It seems to me that the main thrust of START must be reductions. This has been the great trouble, starting with SALT I right down to the present. The Administration should give overriding priority to reductions that will lead

to equal aggregates and will pave the road for the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons. That has been my position ever since I came to the Senate, and it's my position today.

I would think that that will be the direction that the Administration will go. To my knowledge, they have not come down on a final formula in that regard.

NELSON: Do you have any sense of the timing, when the talks with the Russians might begin?

SENATOR JACKSON: I would -- I do not. But I strongly have urged the Administration to move without delay, to begin talks immediately. So that the position of the Administration, which I say will -- I hope will be for reductions, must be the number one priority.

HERMAN: Do you agree with the President, who says that the Soviet Union has a definite margin of superiority; or with Secretary Weinberger, who says that the Soviets have begun to build an edge of superiority; or with neither?

SENATOR JACKSON: We have a deterrent capability. The Soviets are ahead of us in land-based missiles, with throw weight and so on. We are ahead qualitatively in submarine missile-firing forces and bombers. It is adequate at this point in time to deter the Soviets. Everyone worries what it will be down the road unless steps are taken to bring about a reduction. This is the critical thing.

Our target and our goal -- and we must challenge the Soviets: Join with us in elimination of all nuclear weapons. That's why I think the real issue is the need for a communications center, a device by which we can avoid the possibility of war by accident.

I think that's what's really worrying people. Because it doesn't do any good to freeze the balance of terror. You want to eliminate it. And you want to be sure that you have the institutions in place that can avoid war by accident and miscalculation. I think that's what's really worrying the American people, that some trigger-happy episode will lead into a nuclear showdown and a nuclear conflict.

PIERPOINT: But Senator, one thing that's worrying a lot of American people and a lot of people elsewhere in the world is that the fact of the matter is we each, the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, have enough to obliterate each other many times over. And a great many people now favor a freeze at the current level. You do not. Is that correct? Why?

SENATOR JACKSON: I want reductions. A mere freeze

doesn't solve the problem. If they're worried now about the nuclear situation, what good does it do to freeze it unless you have a plan underway to reduce. And I want talks now.

PIERPOINT: But won't a freeze have to come first?

SENATOR JACKSON: I'm not advocating a buildup. I'm saying to the Soviets, for instance, we would defer going ahead with the MX if you will pull back on those huge SS-18s and 19s. I would say to the Soviets clearly, and which we are saying in Geneva, that we will not deploy the cruise missiles in Europe or the Pershing II if you will withdraw your SS-20s.

PIERPOINT: But Senator, you've got to start someplace, and a freeze is a start. And what you're talking about is negotiations which can go on forever, as we've seen.

SENATOR JACKSON: Well, I'm for -- my resolution provides for a freeze at reduced levels.

HERMAN: But your -- one of the key words in your resolution and in a great many others is that old word "verifiable."

SENATOR JACKSON: Oh, I agree.

HERMAN: Are the Russians ready to agree to allow us to verify?

SENATOR JACKSON: Well, Mr. Herman, we face the most -- the severest challenge once you get into an arms elimination process. That, as distinguished from arms control, will require, in my judgment on-site inspection. How else are you going to determine whether they have actually destroyed their missiles and we have destroyed ours? That, I think, will be one of the biggest problems facing the negotiators, how to handle the on-site issue.

HERMAN: Well, as sort of a side issue leading up to that, what is the state of the American intelligence community, especially with Admiral Inman leaving?

SENATOR JACKSON: Well, I must say that Admiral Inman, I've known for many years, was a professional's professional, a man of great integrity, enormous respect, who had the total confidence of members on the Hill. I believe that the intelligence community is making good progress towards revitalization. I understand the replacement has been agreed upon. The name will be formally announced tomorrow. It will be a man that all of us respect in the Intelligence Committee. He is an individual who is a career man, who has been in the service some 31 years. And I believe that the current unfortunate hassle in public regarding Admiral Inman will be rectified, at least to a substantial

extent.

HERMAN: From what you say, I gather that you know who it is. Let me ask you whether you think this person will be able to rebuild the total confidence needed?

SENATOR JACKSON: I do. I think he is a first-rate professional, and it will help the morale within the professional service of the CIA because the man has been selected out of that service, as Admiral Inman was, for all practical purposes...

PIERPOINT: Why don't you go ahead and formally announce it here? We're perfectly willing...

SENATOR JACKSON: Well, I thought, you know, with the Falkland Islands and everything else, that the press corps could be busy scurrying around.

Well, it's just a matter of principle. I've agreed not to give out his name. I've given you a job description and a body description, that I'll be surprised if you can't figure it out before the day's over. And I'm sure it'll be on the CBS Evening News this evening at 6 or 6:30.

NELSON: It's been a tradition, you know, that the top two jobs, at least one of them be held by a military man. From what you're saying, now we're going to have civilian control at the top for the first time. Is that wise?

SENATOR JACKSON: Yes. I don't think -- I don't get excited about whether they're military or not. I want to know what they know. One of our greatest Secretaries of State was a fellow named George Marshall.

PIERPOINT: Senator, one of the reasons that Admiral Inman resigned, we understand, was that he was opposed to the CIA going into domestic spying. We've had some of that in Watergate. Do you think that's a problem now?

SENATOR JACKSON: I would hope not. I think that we've made our position clear in the Intelligence Committee that there has to be an absolute cutoff at water's edge. It's stupid for the CIA to be involved, in any manner, shape or form, with activities in the United States. There's a need of close liaison between the FBI, in counterintelligence especially, and the CIA. I believe that is emerging.

HERMAN: Let me ask you to do a quick change of hats from Jackson of Intelligence to Jackson of Energy.

The oil-producing nations have managed to reduce their production a great deal more than a lot of people thought they

would be able to. Are we about to see the end of the oil glut and rising oil prices which may bring back some inflation to our country?

SENATOR JACKSON: Yes, I think it could happen. And my greatest fear is the possibility of Iran moving into the Gulf militarily to destroy the oil fields in Kuwait, Abu Dhabi, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia because those countries sided with Iraq in the war against Iran. We could wake up one morning and find that those critical facilities have been destroyed. I think that is the greatest immediate threat. We need to build our strategic petroleum reserve.

NELSON: Should we build up our military forces in that region to defend countries like Kuwait, Bahrain, Abu Dhabi, and so on against this possible attack?

SENATOR JACKSON: I think, clearly, we need to have sufficient forces that can deter such a move. And it ought to be made clear to Iran that we will respond to any attempt to cut off the oil supply to the United States or our Western allies.

HERMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Jackson, for being on this rather abbreviated version of Face the Nation.